

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 19 has been withdrawn. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 19 is objected to. Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to unpatentable subject matter. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Chanod *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,389), hereafter “Chanod.”

A. OBJECTION TO CLAIM 19

The Office has objected to the absence of claim 19 for not preserving the original numbering of the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 was not in the original claims. However, in an attempt to ensure clarity, Applicants have inserted claim 19 with an indication of “withdrawn.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 21-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has rejected claims 21-26 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended the claim 21 to include "...a computer readable storage medium having program product for translating content stored thereon, ~~which~~ the program product when executed by a computer, comprising." To this extent, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention satisfies the Office's interpretation of statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Richardson and Brandon, Applicants assert that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 21, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest providing translation process details corresponding to the translation to a user, the translation process details specifying, for a particular word in the content, a context that is based on words in the content surrounding the particular word in which the translating occurred. In contrast, neither of the references cited by the Office provides translation process details corresponding to a particular word in the content. Rather, both references talk in terms of text and string and not of individual words. In addition, the Office admits that confidence metrics of Richardson do not teach specifying a context of the word, instead relying on Brandon. However, the code data of Brandon, which the Office equates with the translation process details of the claimed invention, are not based on words in the content surrounding the particular word in which the translating occurred, but are rather included

extrinsically in a meaning database. See, col. 6, lines 1-54. As such, the code data of Brandon do not teach or suggest the translation process details of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: August 13, 2008

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)